



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,982

10/24/2005

Gregory Durand

033339/292131

9612

826

7590

12/15/2008

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

PESELEV, ELLI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,982

Applicant(s)

DURAND ET AL.

Examiner

Elli Peselev

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for Y represented by groups as set forth on page 11 of the specification and Y' being as set forth on page 10 of the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for Y and Y' as set forth in claim 1. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention.

(A) The breadth of the claims.

The terms such as ester, amide, urea, urethane, ether, thioether are not limited to any specific structure or to the length of said structure.

(B) The level of predictability in the art.

It is well known in the pharmaceutical art that even minor changes in the structural formula of a compound can lead to unpredictable changes in its activity and properties.

(C) The existence of working examples.

The working examples provided are not commensurate in scope with the invention as is now claimed.

(D) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Because there is no way to predict a priori which compounds will be active from the specification or chemical structures alone, an extraordinary amount of trial and error experimentation is required to identify active

Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that with regards to Y, claim 1 has been amended to recite the list as set forth in the specification and with regards to Y' the choice is already limited. Applicant further contends that Y is limited with regards to the chain length. These arguments have not been found persuasive. Only hydrocarbon chain has been limited to six carbon atoms. However, the term such as, for example, ester, encompasses a moiety of any structural formula containing an ester as part of its structure.

Claims 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for use of the compounds as antioxidants, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of preventing the effects of free radicals, to preventing or treating pathological conditions linked to oxidative stress such as those set forth in claim 11 and to preventing or treating the effects of aging as set forth in claim 13. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention.

(A) The breadth of the claims.

The claims encompass methods for preventing and treating a large number of conditions and diseases.

(B) The state of the prior art.

The prevention of such diseases as, for example, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, cancers, cellular aging, etc. is not known in the prior art.

(C) The existence of working examples.

The specification fails to provide any examples directed to the prevention or treatment of any condition or disease.

(D) The quantity of experimentation needed to make and/or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Because there is no way to predict a priori which specific compounds will be effective in preventing or treating which specific disease or condition, an extraordinary amount of trial and error experimentation is required to identify active compounds and their effectiveness in prevention and treatment of diseases and conditions as encompassed by the present claims.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that the therapeutic effect of nitrones in the reduction and prevention of the damage caused by free radicals in biological systems has been demonstrated. This argument has not been found persuasive because there is no known correlation between the therapeutic effect of nitrons and the prevention of any specific disease or condition. The statement in the specification regarding the prevention and treatment of various diseases and conditions is seen to be merely speculative and would require further experimentation in order to confirm said statement.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terminology "poly(ethylene oxide) chain comprising" (claim 1) renders the claims indefinite since it leaves the structural formula open ended i.e. the metes and bounds of the claimed invention cannot be determined.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev
/Elli Peselev/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623

Application/Control Number: 10/533,982
Art Unit: 1623

Page 7